

REMARKS

Amendments

Claims 1 and 12 are amended to incorporate some of the specific water-soluble binders recited in claim 4. The language of claims 3 and 13 is clarified to indicate that the water-soluble polymers in dispersion are present in the impregnating liquor. Claims 4 and 14 are amended to be properly dependent on claims 1 and 12, respectively. Claims 5-6 are cancelled. Claims 7-8 are amended to depend from claim 1 directly.

New claims 17-21 are directed to further aspects of the invention and are supported throughout the disclosure. See, for example, the disclosure bridging pages 6-7.

Election

In the Office Action issued June 17, 2010, the Examiner presents a Restriction Requirement whereby the claims are restricted into the following two Groups: Group I, claims 1-11, drawn to impregnated paper; and Group II, claims 12-16, drawn to a method of making impregnated paper. In response to the Restriction, applicants hereby elect Group I, claims 1-11. The Restriction is, however, respectfully traversed.

In the Restriction, it is asserted that the two Groups lack the same or corresponding technical feature. In support of this assertion, it is alleged that applicants' claim 1 is obvious or anticipated by Wicher et al. (EP 0 697 622). However, this allegation is unsupported as the Office Action presents no rationale as to how the disclosure of Wicher et al. anticipates or renders obvious the claimed invention, especially in light of the fact that the Wicher et al. disclosure is in the German language.

For example, the Restriction fails to demonstrate how the disclosure of Wicher et al. describes or suggests a paper with a high penetration resistance to fats and oils. Further, the Restriction does not demonstrate how the disclosure of Wicher et al. describes or suggests a paper that is produced from strongly beaten pulps with a degree of beating of 15 °SR to 90 °SR, and/or a paper that is internal sized with alkenyl succinic anhydride and/or alkyl ketene dimers (AKD) and/or resin sizes, and/or an impregnating liquor which contains a binder system of 80 to 100 parts by mass of water-soluble binders. Additionally, the Restriction fails to demonstrate how the disclosure of Wicher et al. describes or suggests the binders recited in applicants' amended claim 1.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to set forth sufficient rationale to justify a restriction under PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2. Withdrawal of the Restriction is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brion P. Heaney/

Brion P. Heaney (Reg. No. 32,542)
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza I
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Direct Dial: 703-812-5308
Facsimile: 703-243-6410
Internet Address: heaney@mwzb.com

Filed: July 16, 2010